



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

telegraph company's negligent failure to deliver telegrams sent to a person in another state. *Held*, that the statute is constitutional. *Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Commercial Milling Co.*, 31 Sup. Ct. 59.

Against the validity of this exercise of the state's police power through a statute founded upon the policy of the state to hold telegraph companies to the high standard of care that is desirable in callings quasi-public in nature, it was chiefly urged that the statute interfered with interstate commerce. The court, however, held that no direct restraint ensued and sustained the enactment under the language of a previous case, finding that it may be "fully carried out . . . without in any manner affecting the conduct of the company with regard to the performance of its duties in other states." *Western Union Telegraph Co. v. James*, 162 U. S. 650, 660. For a discussion of the principles involved, see 22 HARV. L. REV. 437.

JUDGMENTS — EQUITABLE RELIEF — ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT FOR ADVANCE PAYMENTS ON CONTRACT OF SALE REPUDIATED BY BUYER. — In a contract for the sale of hops, A was to deliver in October, 1906, and B was to make part payments in the preceding April, May, and September, and on delivery. In March, B repudiated the contract. In May, A brought an action for \$4000, comprising the first two payments, and final judgment was rendered in his favor in December, 1907. A did not tender delivery of the hops, which, in October, 1906, had a market value in excess of the contract price, but subsequently sold them at a loss. B now asks to have the enforcement of the judgment enjoined. The decree of the trial court refusing the injunction was affirmed by necessity, the court being evenly divided. *Livesley v. Krebs Hop Co.*, 112 Pac. 1 (Or.).

Since the market price at the time for delivery was higher than the contract price, if A had sued for a breach of the entire contract, he could have recovered only nominal damages (for the year 1906). *Tufts v. Bennett*, 163 Mass. 398; *Jones v. Jennings*, 168 Pa. St. 493. In the action for the advance payments, B might have urged that this was A's proper remedy, since B had repudiated the entire contract besides refusing to make the payments in question. *Acme Food Co. v. Older*, 64 W. Va. 255. See WILLISTON'S WALD'S POLLOCK, CONTRACTS, 362. But this point, not being taken, was waived. *Krebs Hop Co. v. Livesley*, 51 Or. 527. If B had made the advance payments, and A had wrongfully failed to deliver, B could have recovered what he paid. *Cherry Valley Iron Works v. Florence Iron River Co.*, 64 Fed. 569. See WILLISTON, SALES, § 600. Similarly if, after recovering judgment for advance payments, A had wrongfully failed to deliver, it is submitted that the enforcement of the judgment should have been enjoined. But the seller is excused from tendering delivery, if, when it is due, the buyer repudiates the contract or refuses to make overdue payments. *Cort v. Ambergate, etc. Ry. Co.*, 17 Q. B. 127. Since the litigation was in progress during October, 1906, A was excused from tendering delivery. The result of the principal case, therefore, seems sound in refusing to disturb the judgment.

LEGACIES AND DEVISES — CLASSES OF LEGACIES AND DEVISES — CONDITIONS IN RESTRAINT OF MARRIAGE: WHEN VOID. — A testatrix, having several daughters and one incompetent son, left the son's share to trustees for him for life, and after his death to her "unmarried daughters." Assuming that the beneficiaries were to be determined, not at the death of the testatrix, but at the death of the son, it was contended that the word "unmarried" ought to be stricken out as an illegal condition. *Held*, that the condition was not illegal. *Robinson v. Martin*, 200 N. Y. 159.

The Roman law held no donee bound by conditions tending to restrain his marriage. The ecclesiastical courts grafted this principle upon the law of